NORTHLAND PRESS,
101A, POULTON ROAD,
WALLASEY, CHESHIRE.

CANDOUR The British Views-Letter

To serve as a link between Britons all over the world in protest against the surrender of their world heritage

Vol. XVII, No. 447 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.* November, 1965

RIGHT ROYAL, HEROIC RHODESIA

By A. K. CHESTERTON

FOR the first time since the helter-skelter retreat of Europeans before the onrush of barbarism, backed by alien finance, began, a British community has dared to stand fast, declare unswerving allegiance to the Crown and defy, not only a British Government but the entire finance-regimented world, determined to prize it out of the land which it tamed, civilized and made prosperous. This is not the first time in history that the authority of London has been repudiated or evaded, but certainly never before has a stand been made against a British Government so politically depraved as to take the lead in marshalling, or attempting to marshal, the whole of mankind against its own kith and kin—kith and kin who are upholding the torch of civilization in a continent which everywhere to the north of the Zambezi is still—and in the absence of the White man always will be—a jungle of savagery and a vast nursery-bed of the most fiendish and filthy cruelties, actual or potential.

A BEACON

Ian Smith and his Government have performed what seemed at one time a deed which no British nation retained the nerve to carry through—it has rescued from the abyss of cancerous political degeneracy the heroic thing which is the soul of the British peoples. Although jackal administrations elsewhere have already aligned themselves with London, which itself is only a front for the dominant Wall-st. finance-houses, it may be that the Rhodesian declaration of independence under the Crown will serve as a beacon to reawaken in Britons everywhere on earth their historic will to greatness. It may even be that the fortitude of Rhodesia in resisting abominable pressures, external and internal, will not only stop the dry-rot, but lead to a general British and European counter-attack against rampant subversive financial and political interests, and ensure the return of the rule of law over huge areas of the earth's surface which have been abandoned to barbarism.

In other words, Rhodesia's deliberate action in upholding spiritual values in the teeth of threats to the Rhodesian pocket may—and indeed should—result in the resounding defeat of the diabolical forces of materialism which now have almost the entire world in thrall.

As readers of *Candour* will note, the Rhodesian Government, in pursuing its policy of freeing itself from the fetters of a festering, malodorous liberalism, has—in all matters except timing—taken the precise steps recommended by this periodical, as well as in the strong views expressed by the present writer to Mr. Ian Smith personally, and in subsequent letters and telegrams. That the heat at full blast was turned on the Rhodesian Prime Minister to succumb to financial *force majeure* has been evident from the first, and the greatest credit should be given to the stalwarts of the Rhodesian Front for the support they accorded him against the powerful and devious intrigues of Rhodesian vested interests, which have shown a craven desire to protect their own profits and which elsewhere in Africa have been content to see established the rule of tyrannical Black governments amenable to their influence.

DECISIVE SUPPORT

There is some evidence to suggest that the support of the Rhodesian Front caucus was decisive. The British Prime Minister, summing up the position when reporting to the House of Commons, said that early on the morning of the fateful November 11—a day when loyal Britons the world over commemorate the valour of their warrior dead—he was in telephonic communication with Mr. Smith, in which he claimed to have proved beyond reasonable doubt that every point made by the Rhodesian Government had been fully dealt with on terms which it must find satisfactory. He added:

> "Mr. Smith, who gave me no indication that a decision to take illegal action had been taken, went on indeed to say that his Government were then, while I was speaking to him, in the midst of discussing this. I should add that Mr. Smith went on to say—it was a perfectly frank and friendly conversation—that his Cabinet and he himself regretted that this had happened at this stage. He said—and I quote him—'You find yourself in a position that has gone too far not because of actions on your part'."

Much as I despise the conduct throughout of the British Prime Minister there is no reason to think that he was

not speaking the truth. Whether Mr. Smith's use of the second person meant "one" and not "you"—which as a figure of speech is common enough—or whether it referred to Harold Wilson, is not made clear, but whatever the explanation, beyond question the position which "went too far" was the position insisted upon by the Rhodesia Front. Wilson himself testified to the fact when he said of the Rhodesian Premier: "He has been in these past weeks under intolerable pressure from some of his colleagues and from the unreasoning extremists of the Rhodesian Front".

NO DISCREDIT

The stalwarts thus castigated, who are "unreasonable" enough to insist that their country and its inhabitants, both White and Black, should be saved from any possibility of the re-enactment in their well-governed land of the diabolism of Mau Mau or of the fiendish amok-run in the Congo, will treat with composure smear-words such as "extremist" and "rebel" hurled at them by a smug political slickster who only a few weeks ago was singing "The Red Flag" at the annual conference of the Labour Party. Nor is it to the discredit of Mr. Ian Smith that the momentous step he has taken should have been preceded by doubts and hesitations. Men of heroic stature would not possess that stature were their courses of action plane-sailing, with no moments of personal weakness to overcome.

Nevertheless what Harold Wilson told the House of Commons, placed in conjunction with the series of anti-climaxes contrived by the Ian Smith Government during the last year and more, should be a warning to the Rhodesia Front that their very fine leader will require all the support and all the courage they can place at his disposal to see him and the country safely through the gruelling times which lie ahead. They should also remember that they have many friends in the world, not only in South Africa, where they have the sympathy and good-will of both principal parties, but even in the United Kingdom, and persuade their Government that the time is long overdue for it to acknowledge those of its real friends who have the guts and resolution to stand by Rhodesia until, if need be, the bitter end. Not that the end should be bitter. It is almost certain to lead to more abundant life.

PLEA TO HER MAJESTY

As the League of Empire Loyalists has frequently demonstrated in favour of civilized Rhodesia, as *Candour* has never failed in its support of that cause, and as the present writer has played some small part in Rhodesian affairs, inside the country as well as outside, it is perhaps germane to publish telegrams which, as the League's Founder and Policy Director, he sent out on November 11. The first was to the Queen and read:

> "Empire Loyalists beg your Majesty to rescind dismissal of loyal Rhodesian Government and forbid United Kingdom Government to wage economic war on your Rhodesian subjects of all races, which would be the most criminally wicked action in British history".

The second was to the Honourable Ian Smith and was in these terms:

> "Hearty congratulations on first manifestation of British courage and stand against political criminality since the war stop Empire Loyalists pledge all possible support. A. K. Chesterton."

The third telegram, addressed to Wilson, read:

> "Yours not Ian Smith's is the rebellion against Britain's traditions and decencies stop Empire Loyalists express loathing and contempt at your despicable bullying of better men than you. Chesterton."

It is not to be supposed that H.M. the Queen will even see the telegram, let alone act on it. Although considerable constitutional powers reside in the Crown, occupants of the British Throne no longer see fit to make use of them. Nevertheless, the British Crown, irrespective of whichever head wears it, is still of the greatest symbolical significance. The Crown represents more than a thousand years of our continuing historical entity, and it is to the Crown, and not to any shuffling gang of politicians, that the allegiance of all Britons is owed. The Rhodesian Government has acted with the utmost wisdom in recognising this fact in naming Her Majesty as the Queen of Rhodesia. Rhodesians may find a one-way loyalty difficult to sustain, but sustain it they should. Allegiance being to the Crown, the spiritual links with Britain are preserved. There is also the practical advantage that punitive measures taken against Rhodesia on the ground that Rhodesians are rebels are exposed in every rational sense—and perhaps in every legal sense—as being bogus in motive and origin.

ANSWER TO INSOLENCE

This is a matter which we Loyalists in Great Britain may be called upon to put to the test. Harold Wilson has had the insolence to threaten to treat as rebels not only Her Majesty's loyal Rhodesians but all in the United Kingdom who support them. As we have no intention of withdrawing our support, we hereby serve on him notice that he should enlarge the accommodation in the Tower, or in Brixton prison, or in whatever other place of durance vile this cheapjack careerist and lackey of the New York Money Power proposes to place us.

We shall not, whatever may come, prove ourselves to be unworthy friends of our valiant Rhodesian kinsmen who have had the honour to be the first for twenty years to strike a blow for political sanity and the British will to survive.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

	Per Annum	*Per Half Year*
Open Envelope	£1 1s. 0d.	12s. 6d.
Closed Envelope	£1 2s. 6d.	13s. 6d.
Air Mail	£1 5s. 6d.	15s. 0d.
	($3.75)	($2.00)

CUT AND THRUST

MR. Ian Smith's valiant declaration of independence in the teeth of a misinformed and hostile world has wiped clean of all reproach the endless hesitations, delays, tergiversations and apparent dithering of the Rhodesian Government over the last eighteen months. This issue of *Candour* was already made up when the news broke, with the result that machining was held up so that a new leading article (which appears above) could be written in honour of the event. However, the editorial notes which follow are being allowed to stand, as they faithfully express the opinion of *Candour* during the later phase of what can accurately be described as "the phoney negotiations".

ON the day before the British Prime Minister left Salisbury Mr. Ian Smith quoted the famous reproach of King Henry V to Westmoreland:

He which hath no stomach to this fight,
Let him depart; his passport shall be made,
And crowns for convoy put into his purse:
We would not die in that man's company
That fears his fellowship to die with us.

He then spoke the stirring lines:

We few, we happy few, we band of brothers;
For he today who sheds his blood with me
Shall be my brother . . . .

One can well imagine how Rhodesians must have thrilled in response to this language from a heroic past, used to redeem a timorous present.

However, what happened in Salisbury next day would lead anybody to suppress that Shakespeare had misrepresented the entire Henry V epic. Perhaps what the King really said before the assault on Harfleur was

Once more into the breach dear friends, once more;
Or stay, we'll hold a Referendum
Without mandatory force . . . .

Harfleur having been circumvented, the army approached Agincourt, but of course "the little touch of Harry in the night" really meant that Henry V flew to hold conferences at the court of the King of France and then received a visit from the French King. As a result, when Saint Crispin's day dawned, the two monarchs were able to issue a communique saying that a Royal Commission, upon which a French nominee would serve, had been set up to explore the possibility of agreeing upon whether or not an agreement could be reached in the interests of all concerned about the advisability of fighting the Battle of Agincourt.

* * *

I am well aware of course, of all the bullying and blustering and world-wide intimidation to which Ian Smith and his Government have been subjected, and *Candour* has not been slow to express its resentment (and express it to the highest quarter) at such treatment. Nevertheless the fact should now be faced that during the last eighteen months or more the history of Southern Rhodesia has consisted of a continuous series of anti-climaxes, of which that of October 30 was by far the most pathetic. Mr. Smith's description of the proposed Royal Commission as "a brilliant idea" seemed to me to belong more to *Alice in Wonderland* than to the real world. I also found distasteful his tributes to Harold Wilson, especially after that worthy had demeaned himself and the British people by trying to act as peace-maker between two terrorist leaders whom the Rhodesian Government has been obliged to place under restriction as public menaces.

However, the writing was on the wall much earlier than this, when Mr. Smith offered the entrenchment of the 1961 Constitution in a "solemn treaty" to be lodged with the United Nations. The entire independence issue has hinged upon this Constitution. What was all the fuss about, why was there any talk of independence, negotiated or declared unilaterally, if not to amend the Constitution to ensure that there would be no chance of Black domination through constitutional "advance"?

* * *

Harold Wilson's descent upon Rhodesia with a retinue of over fifty Whitehall functionaries made him the laughing stock of the world. As it was quite impossible to argue that the discussions with Ian Smith would require the presence of this preposterous body-guard of bureaucrats, an official spokesman in London announced that they would be needed to help Wilson govern Great Britain from far-off Salisbury—a statement which must have made Wilson's Cabinet colleagues choke. Had this absurd mannikin embarked upon the half-baked Vietnam peace-mission which he proposed, would he have insisted upon being accompanied by the same sort of flying-circus?

In any event, what need had he of so many advisers when he broke his journey at Nairobi to consult the great oracle, Lord Kenyatta of Lari, the manager of Mau Mau and, according to Her Majesty's representative in Kenya, the "leader to darkness and death?" Wilson was reported to have arrived in Salisbury "with a magic formula". Was it provided by Kenyatta's witch-doctors, and did that great man present him with a package of goat's entrails to serve as a magic charm?

* * *

When forty-one British M.Ps demanded that military force should be used to coerce the Rhodesians, I expressed the hope that they would be placed in the first wave of the assault. The Archbishop of Canterbury has since announced that the exercise of such force would be a Christian duty. If the punishment were made to fit the crime this bloody-minded Primate would meet with a harsher fate than stopping a machine-gun bullet. Instead, he would be captured and buried alive, upside-down, in the company of two goats, which is what Mau Mau did to Professor Leakey. Or, perhaps, be made to suffer the death inflicted by some of the southern Bantu tribes—buried up to the neck in the ground, have his mouth, nose and ears stuffed with honey, and then be left to the ants.

I am not wishing that such vile things be done to His Grace, but merely describing the kind of mentality and the kind of custom which, no doubt in all ignorance, the Archbishop would help to restore to masterdom in Rhodesia were his "Christian" principles accepted and

White Rhodesians shot down to facilitate the return of barbarism. Would that this would-be slaughterer of his own kin and this confessed protector of legalized sodomy were shipped to Africa to function as a witch-doctor rather than continue as the Primate of all England, a position which he befouls.

* * *

The Queen's letter to Mr. Ian Smith was on the surface featureless and innocuous. Its real intention, however, was to bestow the Royal cachet on Harold Wilson's visit—a fact which Rhodesians were not slow to grasp. Mr. Smith, his tongue in his cheek, spoke of it as a "wonderful message from this gracious lady" and added, "This is the sort of thing we live for in Rhodesia—our association with the Queen and our association with Britain . . . " I suppose he has to say such things.

His real interpretation of the letter was revealed in the same speech when he said: "Should the eleventh-hour negotiations fail, Rhodesians may not be able to talk about 'our Queen' ". Nothing could reveal more clearly that Her Majesty's advisers are enjoining her to play things Harold Wilson's way. It is a matter for heart-ache and could become a matter of heart-break. There is no doubt about how Queen Elizabeth I would have dealt with a situation of this kind. "I thank God," she once said, "I am endued with such qualities that if I were turned out of the Realm in my petticoat I were able to live in any place in Christome". But, alas, alas for England. . . .

* * *

It is a pity that when Wilson left Nairobi for Salisbury he did not touch down at Dar-es-Salaam for an interview with James Chikerema, acting President of the banned Zimbabwe African's People's Union, with whose leader the British Prime Minister had a cosy little chat in Rhodesia. Had he done so he would have become even more enthusiastic than he is about the fitness of Africans to take over the reins of government. Chikerema told a reporter that Rhodesia's Africans were ready to rise up and start a "campaign of terror" the moment Mr. Smith declared independence. "In fact," he added, "we should be very sorry if Smith did not declare U.D.I. now. The time for words is past—now is the time for action".

Warming to his subject, this high-minded democrat said: "At first we will attack white farms in isolated areas and with the arms we capture there we will attack white homes in the towns. Our people have been told it will be an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a life for a life". As Harold Wilson is so devoted to the cause in support of which such amiable tactics are to be applied, one wishes that he and his family would arrange to share a kraal with James Chikerema and his family for a six-months' stretch, with Chikerema's favourite witchdoctor and the Archbishop of Canterbury sharing the same accommodation, all enjoying the odours of the goats, which in many tribes are brought at night into the same huts as those wherein their owners sleep. What a feast of culture that would be! Adjoining huts could be reserved for Wilson's bureaucratic entourage—with bush telegraph laid on so that Britain might still enjoy the blessings of Government!

* * *

I read in *The Times* that a Roman Catholic priest told a congregation of 5,000 in Nairobi that President Kenyatta had been given special powers by God "to lead Kenya from political darkness to unextinguishable light". Mgr. John Njenga said Kenyatta's Government was like the Church of Christ—it derived its ministerial powers to administer justice from God. He recalled a passage from the Gospels, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's", and warned that any disobedience against Kenyatta's Government would be disobedience against God. Why, not even British clergymen could have found more appropriate words with which to bless and sanctify Mau Mau!

The occasion was the commemoration of Kenyatta's release from detention, and most churches in Kenya dedicated the day to stress the glory of the event. One of the highlights was to have been—a "last supper", but this, surprisingly, caused an outcry from the British Council of Churches. As degenerate priests of all denominations have done so much to foul their churches by hallowing Mau Mau, there is no obvious reason why they should not soon go all the way and bend their recreant knees in prayer to Jomo Kenyatta as God.

* * *

The Vatican's approval by a large majority of a declaration that the responsibility for the death of Christ should not be attributed indiscriminately to all Jews, living or dead, is a wise one which will appeal to the sense of justice of almost all Christians. To attribute deicide to an entire people, especially those living two thousand years after the event, is preposterously unfair: the only possible exceptions should be the Jews who still applaud what happened, if such there be, and a creature like the late Ben Hecht, who affirmed that the Saviour should have been fed to the lions and gave an abominable and revolting reason for this suggestion.

It is the belief of very many Jews that the saddling upon them of responsibility for the Crucifixion is the cause of what is loosely and inaccurately termed anti-Semitism. The revised attitude of the Catholic Church should dispel this misconception and help to create a more realistic Jewish attitude about the true reason for the friction which their presence among Gentile nations has engendered through the centuries. The dislike of Jews in general is the result of the association of certain Jews with the ruthless exercise of financial power, with commercial practices which tend towards the creation of Jewish monopolies, with the air of proprietorship which their wealth often tempts them to adopt towards the communities in which they dwell, with certain other personal attitudes and with the extraordinary involvement of some of them in subversive activities. Let the Jews forget what happened two thousand years ago and see what they can do to amend the present conduct of those who give the Jewish people as a whole an odious name.

The Vatican Council was not equally wise when other subjects were brought within its purview. For example, it gave the longest and warmest applause of the session to Cardinal Attavianni, secretary of the Vatican Holy Office, when he proposed that the Council should take the initiative for the creation of a world republic comprising all nations. Said the Cardinal: "Just as we hear of plans for a united Europe, and as we have the United States of America, the United States of Brazil and others, why cannot man reach the point where there will be only one world republic in which all nationalistic particularisms would be overcome and where the peace of Christ would reign." I wonder what makes the prelate think that the peace of Christ would reign over so unholy a welter of races and religions. In the ecclesiastical sphere Cardinal Attavianni is of course a distinguished and esteemed functionary, but in the world of practical affairs he seems to be naïve to the point of dimness. Is he not aware that the One World which he advocates is the objective of the most malignant financial powers on earth, eager to secure a stranglehold on mankind?

The Cardinal insists that all totalitarian governments should be abolished, apparently with no notion that his world republic would be totalitarianism in its absolute and most terrible form. As an interim measure he thinks that decisions of the United Nations should be made binding, which can only mean that he has never really looked at this corrupt and cynical body, representing for the most part peoples who are near the beginning in their minds. Good intentions, which would doubtless be pleaded on behalf of this foolish prelate, are not enough. By now Hell must be more than adequately paved.

* * *

On the other hand, Father Pedro Arrupe, General of the Jesuit Order, made very clear his awareness of the malignancy which has the larger part of mankind in its grip. The Rome correspondent of *The Times*, commenting on the lack of direct references to Communism at the Vatican conference, reported: "As bad, however, by any other name, the problem of the 'new Godless society' was raked by the fire of the Jesuit General, who had everything from the press to Wall Street tied up with his atheist conspiracy. . . . It makes use of every possible means at its disposal, be they scientific, technical, social or economic. It follows a perfectly mapped out strategy. It holds almost complete sway in international organizations, in financial circles, in the field of mass communications: press, cinema, radio and television."

As this could perhaps be described as a summary of the theme of *The New Unhappy Lords* I hope that the editor of *The Times*, who must be assumed to read his own newspaper and its supplements, has taken to heart the Jesuit General's exposure of the world conspiracy and now regrets the refusal to publish in the *Times Literary Supplement* the calm, factual letter I sent in reply to a tendentious, sneering and grossly ignorant review of the book which appeared in its columns. Incidentally, is there no means by which the Jesuit General can make known the truth about the conspiracy to His Holiness the Pope?

I have remarked more than once upon the reconstruction of history which has become one of the major propaganda industries of our time. There have been two recent instances, the first of which is relatively insignificant. In a B.B.C. television programme last month Robert Robinson, conducting a sort of brains-trust, referred to George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty Four* as an exposure of the Fascist State. This was too much for Philip Toynbee, who murmured: "Communist, surely". "Oh well", replied Robinson, "let us say authoritarian", for all the world as though there was no difference between Communism and Fascism. Was Robinson genuinely ignorant of Orwell's intention in writing that book? If so, he should be down-graded to reading the B.B.C's weather reports. But such ignorance is difficult to accept.

The more serious attempt at historical reconstruction was made by Robert Murphy, former American Under-Secretary of State, who in an Associated Television broadcast had the audacity—or was this too only ignorance?—to attribute the British disaster at Suez to such factors as the mutual dislike of Eden and Foster Dulles, as though personalities and not policies had been the cause of the debacle. Murphy also argued that the Presidential election had largely determined the American attitude. He said: "Eisenhower was confronted with a situation where our two principal allies, Britain and France, had decided to wage war without consulting the American Government, at the climax of the American Presidential elections when Eisenhower himself was running for re-election". If Eden, as Murphy alleges, had really counted on American support at Suez—Presidential election or no presidential election—he must be an even more foolish fellow than I have hitherto held him to be. "American" policy since the ending of the war has aimed at the destruction of the British Empire and the transference of British spheres of influence into "American" spheres of influence. It is quite impossible for any British Prime Minister or Foreign Secretary to be unaware of this fact.

* * *

What could just conceivably have led Eden to believe that Suez would create a variant in America's otherwise consistent policy pattern was the fact, hitherto concealed, that a meeting had been held a few days before the attack on Egypt between representatives of the British, French and Israeli Governments at Sevres. That France and Israel had concerted measures has long been known, but this is the first time that Britain's participation in the preparatory talks has been revealed—at any rate in Britain. Mr. Michael Baz-Zohar, having been given access to Israeli and French documents, asserted a few weeks ago that the British representative at the talks was Mr. Selwyn Lloyd. He described the Sevres meeting as "the summit of the collusion". Selwyn Lloyd replied that all sorts of sensational allegations had been made but he had "nothing to add". No denial, you notice!

With the precedent of the Balfour Declaration in mind, Eden might have assumed that action in conjunction with Israel would automatically enlist Wall Street's support and therefore the support of the American Government. If so, it is strange that he should have had no knowledge of Zionism's dual aspects—the local

aspect, which was the creation of the Israeli State, and the larger aspect, which relates to the One World power monopoly now in process of being formed. To achieve this monopoly the internationalists would regard Israel as expendable, as "American" policies at the time of Suez very clearly showed.

* * *

Lord Boothby's defence of Winston Churchill from "the unjust charge of taking us back to the gold standard, with all the dire consequences that followed" can scarcely be of service to the man's memory. That policy, we are told, was decided by Montagu Norman, Baldwin and Snowden before he became Chancellor of the Exchequer. True enough, but it does not alter the fact that it was Churchill who gave effect to the decision.

Nor does Boothby's account of Churchill's admission of ignorance furnish an acceptable excuse for the disaster. He writes:

> "He (Churchill) once said to me characteristically after a conference on the Treasury: 'I wish they were admirals or generals. I can speak their language and I can sink them if necessary. But when I am talking to bankers and economists, after a while they begin to talk Persian, and then they sink me instead'."

That is all very well, but nobody compelled Churchill to be Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was not obliged to meddle in matters he did not understand. Incidentally, those familiar with the Alanbrooke Diaries will be tempted to question Churchill's boast that he was able at will to sink the admirals and generals. That is simply not the fact.

* * *

Boothby's account of Churchill's disillusionment with the deflationary policy is also interesting. Churchill wrote to him during a visit to the United States in 1932 saying of the gold-standard: "To Hell with it. It was a trap to destroy us". Quite so! But Boothby does not relate whether Churchill amplified to the extent of revealing by whom the trap was sprung, and for what purpose. Twelve years earlier, as many readers were aware, Churchill described the Bolshevist Revolution as a conspiracy master-minded by Jews. Is it conceivable that he did not recognize in the bankers' plot of 1926 the same malign international financial influence? Boothby must also have known the score.

Yet the latter, by holding his tongue, and in later years helping forward the internationalist conspiracy because of his Federal Europe fixation, became Sir Robert and then Lord Boothby, while his former master achieved fame as "the greatest Englishman who ever lived" (Anthony Eden's words) through carrying out a policy which led to the destruction of the British Empire and the admission of the Red Army into the heart of Europe. Churchill had quite a powerful intellect. I often wonder whether he ever stood outside his own legend and reflected upon the part he had played in the fulfilment of the plot which he knew to be aimed at our destruction. Presumably not, because no man could do that and continue to live with himself without going stark staring mad.

* * *

Paul Felix Warburg died last month in New York. He was the son of Felix Warburg, the nephew of Paul Warburg and the grandson of Jacob Schiff, all partners of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., the notorious international lending house. The marriage of his sister to Walter N. Rothschild lent some colour to the belief that the firm, if not a Rothschild front, was closely associated with the family. His own heading of the New York State Citizens for Eisenhower was also a strong indication of a tie-up with Bernard Mannes Baruch.

Paul Felix Warburg's financial interests had enormous ramifications, while among the more interesting of his honorary appointments was his membership of the National Council of Boy Scouts of America and his vice-presidency of the English-Speaking-Union—not bad for the son of a German Jewish emigré of little more than half a century ago! There seems to be no position to which those yielding the power of the purse may not aspire.

A.K.C.

LOYALISTS SPEAK OUT FOR RHODESIANS

THE peace of the Yankee-style—not to say Nuremberg-style—orgy of self-love and mutual adoration known as the Liberal Party Annual Rally was rudely shattered at the Central Hall on Monday, November 1, when Empire Loyalists roundly denounced Grimond's support of the infamous statement on Rhodesia made by Archbishop Ramsey. The first part of Grimond's speech was unexceptional, uninspiring—in fact unvirtually everything—but the stupor induced by this moribund mediocrity was dispelled when Grimond described Ramsey's monstrous statement as "right" and "wise".

"It is deplorable!" shouted Loyalists from all parts of the hall. "It is a shameful betrayal of White civilisation".

A rather shattered Grimond continued to put the Bilderberg group's line on Rhodesia. "U.D.I. would be treason", he declared.

"Rhodesians owe no duty of loyalty to the British Government," came the reply. "Their loyalty is due to the Queen, and they have already said they will remain loyal to her".

A steady stream of Loyalist protests followed. "You are trying to turn Rhodesia into another Congo," shouted one.

"Aren't you politicians satisfied with the mess you have made of the rest of Africa? One man one vote in Africa means a reversion to savagery".

"If you're so keen on democracy, why not try to enforce it in Ghana?"

Inevitably the Loyalists were finally asked to leave —or manhandled out according to the nature of the

stewards involved. They did not leave quietly. Shouts of 'Stand by Ian Smith!" "Stand by Rhodesia!" and "Support civilisation" resounded through the hall as they departed.

The League team included Patricia Mackey, Avril Walters, Peter Bleach, Philip Burbidge, Rodney Legg, Michael Lloyd, John Singleton, and Bob and Les Sweetland.

Reports of League activities during October are contained in Leslie Greene's report to the League's A.G.M.

PROTEST TO ARCHBISHOP

THE following letter was sent by the League of Empire Loyalists to the Archbishop of Canterbury on Wednesday, 27th October:

"We feel that we speak on behalf of millions of our fellow-countrymen when we write to protest against your abominable encouragement of the idea that the British people should use force against their kinsmen in Rhodesia.

"By basing your arguments on the political method of the counting of heads—a method which has nothing whatsoever to do with Christianity—Your Grace has forfeited the right to expect Christians to accept those arguments as coming from one of their spiritual leaders.

"Your Grace cannot be unaware that—as was admitted in the Devlin Report—terrorism and intimidation are regarded by African so-called Nationalists as normal political weapons. We cannot accept as Christian guidance the doctrine that political power should be forcibly taken out of civilised hands and given to men to whom terrorism and intimidation are normal political weapons, simply because these men claim to represent the majority.

"One remarkable assertion in Your Grace's speech to the British Council of Churches was: "Our country had its obligations to Poland. We fulfilled our obligations." Your Grace omitted to mention that, under pressure from the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States of America, the Polish people were damnably betrayed, as we are under pressure today from the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States of America to betray our kinsmen in Rhodesia. It was not inapt that your Grace should have chosen to cite Poland in support of the sort of arguments which you put forward, for Poland today languishes under the Godless tyranny of Communism. Does Your Grace seriously suggest that we should be fulfilling our obligations by betraying Rhodesia to such a fate?"

UNPUBLISHED REPLIES

The League's protest was widely reported at home and abroad. One paper which did not report it, however, was *The Times,* which earlier had published a series of letters from opponents of the Rhodesian Front Government, but failed to publish a reply which Mr. A. K. Chesterton sent to an anti-White outpouring from Mr. Humphry Berkeley, M.P. This read:

"Sir,—Mr. Humphry Berkeley unwittingly concedes Mr. Ian Smith's case when he writes that were the Rhodesians to seize independence that action would 'threaten the safety and security of the British minorities in Zambia, Kenya and Tanzania'. Governments unable to protect minorities cannot be considered adult or civilised. It is to just such a Government that Mr. Berkeley obviously thinks that power in Rhodesia should be transferred."

Earlier Austen Brooks had sent a reply to a letter from Mrs. Jo Grimond and two other spokesmen of the Liberal Party. This *The Times* also failed to print.

LOYALISTS IN GOOD HEART

A CROWDED and enthusiastic meeting of the League of Empire Loyalists at the Caxton Hall, Westminster, on October 30 applauded loudly after the chairman of the League, Mr. D. S. Fraser Harris, had opened the proceedings by reading a message of thanks from Her Majesty the Queen for the League's message of loyal greetings sent to Her Majesty on the occasion of its twelfth Annual General Meeting.

THE chairman opened his address by remarking that this was not only the League's 12th Annual General Meeting, but the first at which its founder, Mr. A. K. Chesterton, had not been present, an absence which all deeply regretted. "However," he added, "I am happy to be able to tell you that his absence in South Africa earlier than usual is not due to a deterioration in his general health, but a precautionary measure advised by his doctor in view of the "succession of maladies", as A.K. himself puts it, which has attacked him during the summer and which has temporarily lowered his powers of resistance."

The Chairman then said: "This year has been notable for us for three events: (1) The publication of *The New Unhappy Lords.* By lending, giving or recommending the book to our friends, and enemies, we can now ensure that our whole case is presented to them lucidly and concisely. (2) The outbreak of war between two members of the so-called Commonwealth, revealing the "insubstantial fabric of this vision." (3) Rhodesia's struggle for independence, indeed her survival. What is happening in Rhodesia is of supreme importance not only to Great Britain but to the world at large. If the negotiations between Mr. Ian Smith and the British Government have served no other purpose, they have at least exposed for all to see the fraudulence of the so-called cold war. Although during the entire period of the negotiations Mr. Smith was subjected to threats and intimidation from every quarter, here and abroad, even from those contemptible little creatures with whom he was actually negotiating, he remained dignified and courageous throughout. What his intimidators seemed to forget, or did not know, was that Queen Elizabeth is Queen of Rhodesia by the grace of God and not by the grace of Harold Wilson."

Mr. Fraser Harris then commented ironically on the qualifications of the various individuals and countries who had seen fit to warn Mr. Smith against U.D.I., and

then went on to say: "What a pharisaical rabble! On the one hand stands Ian Smith, representing Christian civilisation, as he himself has proudly proclaimed, and supported only by Portugal and South Africa. On the other hand—the satanic forces of subversion, the exponents of political blackmail, venality, corruption, opportunism, oppression, Communism, Internationalism, barbarism and One-Worldism. That is the real division of the world today."

The chairman said he believed the issues involved were not so much political or economic as spiritual, and that the national spirit and the racial spirit formed part of our spiritual inheritance. Materialism alone could not satisfy the human spirit. That was why we ought not to be unduly dismayed by the might of the Philistines.

"Mr. Ian Smith has become a symbol of sanity in an insane world," said Mr. Fraser Harris. "He has dared to defy the whole infernal conspiracy, backed as it is by the world's military might and financial resources, the controlled Press and broadcasting services. But Ian Smith possesses what his enemies lack—spiritual strength. He has boldly declared 'Come what may, we shall always sing "God save the Queen". We are British. We shall remain British. We shall keep our blue flag, with the Union Jack in the top left corner. We shall continue to drink the loyal toast. And we shall always dream of the great reconciliation.' All honour to this great Christian patriot, this defender of the faith. It may well be that he has inaugurated that resurgence of the true British spirit for which we have been looking and working for so long."

RHODESIANS BACKED

Leslie Greene's Report

AN outline of the League's activities during October in support of the upholders of civilised rule in Rhodesia was given by Leslie Greene (Mrs. Richard von Goetz) in presenting the Secretary's Report. She said:

"The resumption of the publication of *Candour*—although at the moment only on a monthly basis—has had a tonic effect on many members who find it invaluable not only in that it supplies them with useful ammunition in presenting the Loyalist case, but also in that it increases their sense of 'belonging' to the movement.

"As I make this report the question that is uppermost in most people's minds is: What is to be the fate of Rhodesia? To that question it is not as yet possible to give an answer, but what we can say is that as long as there is a White Government in Rhodesia loyal to the Crown and striving to prevent civilisation there from being swamped by the tide of barbarism that is washing over Africa, that Government can count on the unswerving support of the League of Empire Loyalists. Ever since Mr. Ian Smith became Prime Minister some eighteen months ago, the League and *Candour* have been urging upon him and his Government that, if they should issue a Universal Declaration of Independence, it should be accompanied by a reaffirmation of their allegiance to the British Crown, as distinct from the United Kingdom Government. While he was in London, as you will have noticed, Mr. Smith seems to have got the message. The message went further than Mr. Smith, for, as the *Guardian* reported shortly before his London visit ended: "The Empire Loyalists sent messages to the Queen and to Mr. Smith condemning 'the infamous intention' of the British Government to force all races in Rhodesia 'to abandon civilised rule and thus destroy themselves and their country'. At the same time, the Loyalists begged Mr. Smith 'to affirm allegiance to the Crown, as distinct from British Government'." In his message to the Queen Mr. Chesterton begged Her Majesty to intervene on the side of civilisation.

"You will most of you have read of the most effective demonstration by Rodney Legg—a young man whose readiness to carry the war into the enemy's camp never diminishes—at the Labour Party conference at Blackpool, when just before the ritual singing of 'The Red Flag' he produced a Union Jack and declared: 'This is the flag which stands for British loyalty—not the red flag of Communist tyranny.' Soon afterwards came the attempt by Edward Heath to out-Wilson Wilson in urging Rhodesia along the road to destruction. This clearly called for a League protest, and once again Rodney Legg was on hand at the Conservative Party conference to help Rosine de Bounevialle deliver it. As Heath began to address the opening session, Rosine—to the horror of the Tory stewards!—appeared on the platform. 'The League of Empire Loyalists asks the Tory Party to support civilised Government in Rhodesia,' she shouted. 'Don't be cozened by Heath into ganging up with Wilson to destroy that Government. Rhodesians fought with us in two world wars. Don't betray them now.' A few minutes later, from the gallery, Rodney repeated the call.

MESSAGE RUBBED HOME

"Then on Friday afternoon of last week Austen Brooks went out of the League office to find Parliament Square and Whitehall filled with United Nations Flags. A few minutes later he delivered to 10 Downing Street a letter asking Harold Wilson: 'Now that you and your Ministers have sung the Red Flag at Blackpool and filled Parliament Square and Whitehall with the pale blue and white flag of the United Nations, do you seriously expect anybody to be fooled by your pose as champion of the Red, White and Blue in your attempts to prevent Mr. Ian Smith and his Government from maintaining civilisation in Rhodesia?'

"This message was rubbed home last Monday, when the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Michael Stewart, addressed a United Nations meeting at Church House. As Mr. Stewart began to speak Rodney Legg—who is rapidly qualifying for the title of the League's Flag Lieutenant—draped a Union Jack over the U.N. Flag on the platform and declared: 'Empire Loyalists say this is the flag which should command British loyalty, not the pale blue and white rag of the U.N. The United Nations is the enemy of Rhodesia *and* of Britain. Empire Loyalists say support our friends, not our enemies.' The stewards who hustled him out returned to find Peter Bleach, Rosine de Bounevialle and Avril Walters standing in front of the platform with placards bearing such message as: 'One Man One Vote equals One-Party Tyranny in Africa.' Avril told the meeting: 'The only thing that unites the United Nations is its anti-White and anti-British policies." Later, when the

Foreign Secretary looked forward to the day when the U.N. would provide a World Parliament, Les Sweetland indignantly asked him: "And what would be the position of the Queen with such a set-up?" Bob Sweetland, John Singleton, Molly Bull, Geoff Parker and other Loyalists in the audience so rattled Stewart that at question time he refused point-blank to answer questions on Rhodesia.

"Finally, after the Archbishop of Canterbury's speech to the British Council of Churches, Austen Brooks sent him a strongly-worded protest against what he described as 'your abominable encouragement of the idea that the British people should use force against their kinsmen in Rhodesia.'

NOT IDLE

"I have devoted much of this report to events of the last month because these have been the most immediately important events. The League was not idle during the rest of the year, as those of you who have read *Candour* will know. Loyalists played their part in the discomfiture of Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker at Leyton, and even the *Daily Express* broke its usual silence about us to report our telegram to Wilson when the result was announced: 'Are Leytonians lepers too?'

"Another telegram to Harold Wilson early this year read: 'Your recommendation of Fenner Brockway for life peerage an insult to all civilised men and women in Africa and Asia.' Earlier a League team had protested vigorously when Brockway and David Ennals, of the Anti-Apartheid Movement, spoke in support of two members of Joshua Nkomo's banned Zimbabwe African People's Union.

"Soon afterwards Canon Collins came under League fire when he took the chair for Martin Luther King. Talking of Canon Collins, our counter-demonstration against the annual Easter ban-the-bomb shufflers was excellently reported in most editions of—of all papers—the *Daily Mail*.

"Lord Caradon—the former Sir Hugh Foot—Mr. Selwyn Lloyd and others also came under League fire for their advocacy of internationalist policies, which we still maintain are inconsistent with the oath of allegiance taken by Members of both Houses of Parliament.

OVERSEAS ACTIVITY

"To the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference we sent messages of protest against the exclusion of Mr. Ian Smith's Government, and Loyalists throughout the British world sent cables to Mr. Smith assuring his Government of support in its struggle to maintain civilised rule. I should stress at this point that while my annual report concerns itself with League activities in the United Kingdom, there are always Loyalists active in other parts of the British world.

"Finally, League speakers have addressed a number of meetings of other organisations—quite apart, of course, from the Labour Party and Tory Party conferences! One notable occasion was a couple of months after our last A.G.M., when Austen Brooks visited University College, London, and successfully defeated the motion that 'This House believes that nationalism is out-dated, outmoded and irrelevant.'

"We all regret the difficulties which have prevented the attendance here today of such League stalwarts as Lady Freeman, Air-Commodore Oddie, Mrs. Isemonger, Mrs. Atherley, Frank Lockwood, Patrick Lethaby, Peter Bleach, Frank Barter, Mrs. Joyce Mew and Stephen Waugh, all of whom have sent apologies for their absences. In spite of the absence of these and other members who for one reason or another have been prevented from coming today, I am sure that it will be most encouraging to A.K. to know that we have such a good attendance in spite of his own absence."

FINANCE NEEDED

Austen Brooks's Report

PRESENTING the Treasurer's Report, Austen Brooks added an expression of his own regret to those of David Fraser Harris and Leslie Greene at the absence of the founder of the movement. "I would also like to say," he added, "how very glad I am—and I know that A.K. is too—that our chairman and organising secretary *are* able to be with us this year.

"My report this year will consist primarily of a message which I have received from the founder of our movement. A.K. feels that the British people have reached the nadir of their misfortunes and betrayals, and that it is essential for the League to redouble its efforts to apprise the nation of the deadly perils confronting it. *There is no possible way of doing this except through activity all along the line, backed by adequate financial support.* Whenever appeals have been made to members some have invariably plunged their hands deep into their pockets, not once but over and over again. On that account the making of appeals has become a source of acute embarrassment. What A.K. would like, and he has put this forward many times in the past, is for groups living in the same general area to regard themselves as fund-raising committees entrusted with the task of making fresh contacts and seeking the support of wealthy people in their neighbourhood.

CALL FOR DECENTRALISATION

"A small financial team has just begun to operate in London under the direction of a Management Committee appointed by the Policy Director, but here again we find the initiative coming from headquarters, whereas what we want above all things is a decentralisation of League effort, and much more activity in areas outside London. In Laxton,for example, we have a group which through the years has shown enormous enthusiasm and been responsive to every call made upon it by Headquarters. But if one were to enquire what systematic steps have been taken by the Laxtonites to interest influential people in the neighbourhood the answer would probably be a dusty one. The same thing today applies to every other group in the country. Invariably direction from Headquarters is awaited before any plan is formulated or carried out. This gives one the impression, perhaps not altogether wrong, that the Movement ceases to move except when Headquarters applies the spur.

"A.K. has asked me to make yet another appeal for this omission to be remedied. In fact, over the last twelve years the financial onus of keeping the Movement in being has rested entirely on his own shoulders

so far as organisational approaches are concerned, and this responsibility he feels he must now share with members throughout the country and throughout the British world.

"That is A.K.'s message. To it I will add this. If there are people here today, or people who read this report—as I hope there are—who would be willing to undertake the task which he has outlined, would they please let me know. We must find fresh sources of finance."

Mr. John Straw was unanimously reappointed as the League's auditor.

After that very staunch Loyalist Mr. Malcolm Skeggs had been unanimously appointed to fill a vacancy on the National Executive Committee the meeting discussed four Resolutions, three of which were passed unanimously and the fourth with only three dissentients. The first, proposed by Mr. Rodney Legg was: "That this Annual General Meeting of the League of Empire Loyalists wishes to alert members and supporters of Her Majesty's Opposition to the fact that Great Britain's entry into the European Common Market is being introduced insidiously as a part of the Conservative Party's official policy, and reminds them that abandonment of sovereignty to the European Economic Community would be an act of treason."

STOP COLOURED IMMIGRATION

On behalf of Mr. Peter Bleach, Mr. Austen Brooks proposed: "That this Annual General Meeting of the League of Empire Loyalists reiterates the League's demands, in the interests of all races, that coloured immigration into the British Isles should be stopped." An amendment moved by Miss Lorna Angelo to add the words: "and that those coloured immigrants already in Britain should be encouraged and helped to return to their countries of origin at the first available opportunity" was unanimously accepted.

Mr. R. D. Molesworth proposed: "That a Research Department of the League be established, with the primary purpose of assisting in the work of exposure, already commenced, and that members throughout the country be asked to assist in its operation so as to avoid adding to the burden of work already falling on the movement's leadership."

To her motion "That this annual general meeting of the League of Empire Loyalists pledges its support under all circumstances to Her Majesty's loyal subjects in Rhodesia, irrespective of the attitude of any British Government," Miss Rosine de Bounevialle agreed to Lt.-Col. R. L. Carew's proposal to add the words: "to say nothing of the Archbishop of Canterbury."

BOOK'S NEW EDITION

Aidan Mackey's Announcement

AFTER discussion of the Resolutions Mr. Fraser Harris vacated the chair in favour of Mr. Aidan Mackey, deputy chairman of the Policy Committee, and the meeting resolved itself into a *Candour* Council of War.

On the first occasion that A.K. had regrettably had to miss the A.G.M., Aidan Mackey said, he had no intention of inviting comparisons which could only be to his own detriment by making a speech, but he did want to emphasise—through perhaps quite unnecessarily to such an audience—that A.K. had not gone crawling off to South Africa to lie about waiting for strength to flow slowly back into him.

The fruits of A.K.'s stay in South Africa last year had been the making and consolidation of a number of highly important contacts—and, of course, the writing of *The New Unhappy Lords*. This seemed an appropriate moment to announce that, the first edition having sold out, the book was now available as a paperback at 10s. 6d. Extra copies had also been bound to keep the 25s. clothbound edition available to those who wanted it.

There was loud laughter when Aidan Mackey went on: "In order to go into paperback, a book has to be either pornography or very, very good.

"And this, I need hardly stress," he added, "is not pornography."

Stressing the need for the meeting to do its utmost to produce constructive and practical ideas for increasing finance and membership, he said that A.K.'s doctor was convinced that at the root of the trouble where A.K.'s health was concerned lay 12 years of continuous worry and responsibility for keeping the movement in being. The need for others to share that responsibility must surely be clear to all.

STIRRING MESSAGE

A. K. Chesterton's Recording

The meeting received with tremendous acclamation an inspiring message which had been tape-recorded by Mr. A. K. Chesterton before his departure for South Africa, and a cable was sent to him afterwards which read: "Enthusiastic meeting sends best wishes for restoration of your health and thanks for your inspiring recording."

In response to Mr. Mackey's request for practical suggestions arising out of the recording, Mr. George Clark of Sheffield, a staunch supporter of the movement for many years, was quick off the mark with a suggestion that Mr. Chesterton's address should be reproduced as a booklet. The meeting immediately seized on this suggestion, not only taking an on-the-spot collection to cover the cost of a first printing with the request that it be sent out with the next available issue of *Candour*—a request with which, as readers will have noted, we have complied—but also resolved that supporters of the movement not present be asked to send in contributions to cover the cost of printing extra copies.

Miss Nettie Bonnar suggested that the booklet would be invaluable to those seeking support for the movement from non-League members, and urged that people should buy several copies of it for this purpose. Austen Brooks promised that the price per copy for orders for half a dozen or more would be progressively reduced.

The League's founder sent a cable reading: "All power to A.G.M.; regret unavoidable absence", and among other messages of greeting were cables from Canadian, New Zealand, South African and Rhodesian supporters of the movement.

RACE AND NATIONAL CONSCIENCE

By D. S. FRASER HARRIS

THE question of coloured immigration has been the most vital political, social and religious issue of our times; and one, moreover, which will affect future generations.

The belated Commonwealth Immigration Act of 1962 was so mutilated during its passage through Parliament that its effect has been minimal. There can be no doubt, however, that the electoral results at Smethwick, Eton and Slough, Perry Bar and Leyton have had a salutary effect on the executives of both the Conservative and Labour parties, which shows what the man in the street is still able to accomplish when he puts country before party.

If there has been no real change of heart among the Socialists there has at least been a change of policy. The purpose of their recent White Paper is, allegedly, to tighten up some of the provisions of the Act and to block some of the loopholes. A glimpse of how effective these proposed measures are likely to be in practice was afforded us when Miss Alice Bacon, Minister of State, Home Office, told the fraternal delegates at the Labour Party Conference at Blackpool that the 8,500 immigrants from the Commonwealth to be admitted annually could be multiplied by five when wives and other dependents were added. The number of coloured immigrants now living in this country has been variously estimated to be between one and three million, a very large proportion of whom are here illegally. The deputy chairman of Middlesex Area Sessions Appeals Court has complained bitterly that people could snap their fingers at the immigration authorities.

RACE BILL'S THREAT

Now we are threatened by the Race Relations Bill, which has already passed its third reading and will presumably become law during the next parliamentary session, for neither the Conservatives nor the Liberals are likely to oppose it. It would seem that the indigenous, protesting Whites will thereafter be treated as criminals. In defending our position it is essential that we be well briefed and speak with authority. Wide reading on the subject has probably been undertaken by only a few of us. For those who prefer to find all their data in a single volume there is now available *Racial Contours: The Factor of Race in Human Survival,* by H. B. Isherwood (Times Press Ltd., Isle of Man; distributed by Sidgwick & Jackson Ltd., 18s.)

This is not just another book on race relations but a history of mankind; a scholarly and comprehenesive treatise written in popular language. Its scope is immense, covering the whole globe, and in the dimension of time it ranges from the origins of the cosmos itself to the racial divisions of mankind today. So thoroughly has the author studied his subject that from the point of view of our immediate requirements *vis-a-vis* the racial problem in this country, there is hardly, I would venture to say, a single aspect which has not been adequately dealt with. Mr. Isherwood boldly faces facts and refuses to bow to current political fashons. The book will undoubtedly enrage the ideologues of the three main political partes, and of course the Communists, for it debunks their racial misconceptions and propaganda, in particular the classic misconception that all men of all races are equally capable of reaching and maintaining the highest standards of civilisation. Here is a warning and an appeal to the national conscience, the author's thesis being that continued neglect to recognise the value and significance of the intrinsic racial differences will inevitably lead to the decay of nations and ultimately of humanity itself.

CONTROVERSIAL SUBJECT

Obviously, in a book of this nature, the controversial subject of evolution cannot be avoided. The author's own interpretation of organic evolution will, predictably, offend those who regard any theory of evolution as unscriptural, while being no more acceptable to many Huxleyite evolutionists who are agnostics. Anticipating this, Mr. Isherwood assures us in the Introduction that he can find nothing irreconcilable between scientific fact and spiritual faith; and in those passages necessarily touching on religious matters he reveals himself as a sensitive deist, as for instance when he says:

> "If as some claim a heavenly meaning and purpose can be discerned in the workings of the material universe then the evidence as put before us by science clearly shows that the racial qualities of man are playing a necessitous part. To suppress these qualities or to ignore them is to attempt to thwart the purposive design of the natural order which in devout minds has been fashioned by divine hands. If faith and religion are built on what we know has gone before then we must recognise race and respect it, study it and preserve it, for through race we have been created, and through race we shall rise or fall on earth as the incontrovertible inferences of evolution proclaim."

Racial Contours is the outcome of some thirty years of study and first-hand experience, on the edge of Harlem, in Africa, Asia, Russia and elsewhere. The extensive bibliography, which includes a great many books opposed to the main thesis, testifies to the author's wide reading, his lack of prejudice, and his thirst for knowledge. Among the factors discussed are patriotism, prejudice, emotionalism, the use of Marxian slogans, race-hatred, race-consciousness, inherited behaviour, mongrelization, congenital misfits, brotherhood, and the U.N. Chapters 1 (Musings on the myth of racial equality), 2 (The real meaning of race, 11 (Race and prejudice) and 12 (Racial friction in England and elsewhere) would make excellent pamphlets.

Surely the national conscience must be aroused when doctrinaire politicians, completely ignorant of the subject, seek to impose their own perverted, political and unscientific theories about what constitutes an Englishman. At the beginning of September Mr. Richard

Marsh, Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Labour, dared to utter the following absurdity:

> "We have to accept that Britain is already a multi-racial society. From now on our schools will turn out an ever-increasing number of black, brown and coffee-coloured teenagers who are not immigrants, but coloured English men and women who know no other country."

This is, of course, a biological falsehood for, as Mr. Isherwood points out:

> "A Negroid born of Negroid parents in England does not become Nordic by that fact, but remains a Negroid for all purposes of racial classification. And his descendants cannot be other than Negritic."

In this country there have sprung up organisations to serve the interests of various racial minorities, and there are now official and semi-official bodies that aim to assist, or force, disparate races to integrate. More recently the White communities in some of the most congested areas have found it necessary to form their own organisations in self-defence. Thus there has been built up in this country, quite needlessly, a new social restlessness, a malaise which could easily lead to such shocking incidents as have occurred in America.

White Britons and White people of other lands, who are proud of their race, will find this book a superb weapon in the struggle which lies ahead and which threatens the life blood of our race. Indeed, we owe it to posterity to protect ourselves from racial extinction, and to preserve our peerless national heritage from oblivion.

"THE NEW UNHAPPY LORDS"

First edition sold out: Paperback now available

SOON after the last issue of Candour **was published, the first clothbound edition of** The New Unhappy Lords **was sold out, and, as was announced at the twelfth annual general meeting of the League of Empire Loyalists on October 30, a paperback edition is now available.**

The price of this new edition is 10s. 6d., and the term "paperback" is perhaps misleading. The cover, incorporating the striking motif **devised by the well-known designer Mr. Henry Stephenson for the dust-jacket of the original edition, is of a high quality stiff card.**

A new edition of the 25s. clothbound book is now also available to meet orders from libraries, booksellers or, of course, individual buyers, and there are still a very few copies available of the special autographed edition at £2 2s.

Tributes to *The New Unhappy Lords* continue to pour in from all parts of the world. A reviewer in *Western Destiny* of Los Angeles writes that A. K. Chesterton "is without doubt one of the greatest living commentators in the English language."

"THOROUGH PATRIOT"

He adds: "As editor of *Candour,* sub-titled "British Views-Letter", his comments are eagerly read in South Africa and Rhodesia, as well as in Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States. What is the reason? A. K. Chesterton is the only living commentator who not only knows his history but has helped to make it. A thorough patriot, holder of the Military Cross for action as an officer, he fought in both World Wars in Africa and in Germany.

"The New Unhappy Lords," the reviewer declares, "belongs with Spengler's *Hour of Decision* in the knapsack of every marching patriot . . . . A. K. Chesterton supplies us with many missing links: the actions of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, "in cahoots" with American Council of Foreign Relations, framing One World policies. The Money Power already acting as the secret government of the U.S. and the *"de facto* secret government which incessantly plots through the United Nations, Nato, Seato and many other agencies to become the open and acknowledged world government which has so long been incubated."

The forthright and courageous French writer Pierre Hofstetter, in his "London Letter" to *Decouvertes,* the French monthly published in Lisbon, writing of the One World conspiracy, declares: "I counsel, in this complex and delicate domain, for the truth—unpalatable, cruel and generally kept hidden—a study of the recent masterpiece (in my basic opinion) *The New Unhappy Lords* (Candour Publishing Company, London) by the remarkable British journalist A. K. Chesterton, for he analyses with clarity the nature of the real conspiracy against the West. The *City Press,* a financial journal of the City, has described the book as "dangerous"—and that's saying something!"

AMERICAN TRIBUTES

"Would that truth were not in such general bad repute, for you have captured its essence," wrote Mr. A. L. Benjamin, of Illinois, while another American tribute came from Miss Olga Butterworth, of Brooklyn, who wrote: "I have read and am now re-reading your excellent book, and offer my congratulations. Your masterful analysis of world politics and tying things together as you have refutes all argumentation on the part of the conspirators and their non-Jewish degenerate catspaws and makes this book compulsory reading by all who call themselves patriots."

From Mrs. K. Heusler-Vos, whose Veritas Bookshop in Pretoria plays so valuable a role in the political education of South Africans, came this tribute: "Now that I have read it, all I can say is that without a shadow of doubt this is the most important political treatise to come off a British press since the last war."

At home Major F. R. Rothwell wrote: "I enjoyed *The New Unhappy Lords* tremendously. It is amazing how much factual information you have packed into a comparatively short book and how neatly your deductions have been made from the facts."

Printed by the Berence Press Ltd., 97 Cobbold Road, London, N.W.10, and Published by the Candour Publishing Co., 11 Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, London, S.W.1